UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/686,114	10/11/2000	David Kunin	13062.1USU1	4941

23552	7590	11/24/2003

MERCHANT & GOULD PC
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER
BUI, KIEU OANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2611	

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/686,114	KUNIN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	KIEU-OANH T BUI	2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>4&5</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 10-12 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Ogasawara (U.S. Patent No. 6,543,052 B1).

Regarding claim 10, Ogasawara discloses "a method of accessing/browsing the Internet

on a television, comprising: receiving a voice signal from a user, the voice signal controlling a

television display which is capable of displaying requested Internet contents via a television

channel" (Fig. 4, col. 2/lines 19-40; and col. 3/lines 44-65 and col. 4/lines 28-51 as a user uses a

remote control unit as a portable telephone for controlling a television display including Internet

accessing/browsing via a television channel, and a microphone for capturing the voice signal

from the user at the portable remote device 14). Furthermore, Ogasawara further discloses the

step of "routing the voice signal to a voice recognizer for recognizing/interpreting/analyzing the

voice signal and generating a command signal, the voice recognizer being capable of

recognizing/interpreting/analyzing voice signals transmitted from a plurality of users" (Fig.

4/item 78 for a voice recognizer; col. 4/lines 29-38 for the use of voice recognition, col. 5/line 50

to col. 6/line 4 for the step of routing the voice signal to the voice recognizer, and col. 6/line 66

to col. 7/line 10 for more details on the voice recognizer 78); and "accessing/browsing the

Internet the requested Internet contents" (Figs. 5A & 5b for a browser and Internet browsing

using the browser as well as the requested transaction for downloading a particular program or

text, see col. 9/lines 14-37); and "presenting accessed/browsed Internet contents on the television

via the television channel" (Fig. 4, col. 3/lines 53-65, and col. 4/lines 4-12 for a TV screen for

displaying the requested Internet content via the television channel using the conventional

television reception functions).

As for claim 11, in further view of claim 10, Ogasawara further discloses "wherein the

television channel is a cable television channel", i.e., the user can view a normal television

channel via a cable television channel since a cable provider 20 is included for service (Fig.

1/item 20, and col. 3/lines 15-24).

As for claim 12, in further view of claim 10, Ogasawara further discloses "wherein the

television channel is a satellite television channel", i.e., the television channel is a satellite

television channel since a satellite system 16 is included (Fig. 1, and col. 3/lines 53-65).

Regarding claim 16, Ogasawara discloses "a computer program storage medium readable

by a computing system and encoding a computer program of instructions for executing a

computer process for accessing/browsing the Internet on a television, the computer process

comprising: receiving a voice signal from a user, the voice signal controlling a television display

which is capable of displaying requested Internet contents via a television channel" (i.e.,

Fig.4/item 10 is a STB and it can read as a computer storage medium by a computing system, see

col.6/line 12-52; and Fig. 3, data encoder 40 and channel coder 46 are used for encoding a

computer program of instructions for executing computer process for converting the voice signal

from the user and allowing the Internet access on the television, see col. 3/lines 15-52 for

computer application software addressed, and col. 5/lines 9-49 for encoding processes as inputs

as data or voice).

Ogasawara further discloses the step of "routing the voice signal to a voice recognizer;

recognizing/ interpreting/ analyzing the voice signal and generating command signals, the voice

recognizer being capable of recognizing/interpreting/analyzing voice signals transmitted from a

plurality of users" (Fig. 4/item 78 for a voice recognizer; col. 4/lines 29-38 for the use of voice

recognition, col. 5/line 50 to col. 6/line 4 for the step of routing the voice signal to the voice

recognizer, and col. 6/line 66 to col. 7/line 10 for more details on the voice recognizer 78); and

"accessing/ browsing the requested Internet contents; and presenting accessed/browsed Internet

contents on the television via the television channel" (Figs. 5A & 5b for a browser and Internet

browsing using the browser as well as the requested transaction for downloading a particular

program or text, see col. 9/lines 14-37; and Fig. 4, col. 3/lines 53-65, and col. 4/lines 4-12 for a

TV screen for displaying the requested Internet content via the television channel using the

conventional television reception functions).

Regarding claim 17, Ogasawara inherently discloses "a computer data signal embodied in

a carrier wave readable by a computing system and encoding a computer program of instructions

for executing a computer process for accessing/browsing the Internet on a television, the

computer process comprising: receiving a voice signal from a user, the voice signal controlling a

television display which is capable of displaying requested Internet contents via a television

channel", i.e., Ogasawara discloses a computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave readable

by a computer system by using a known encoding technique or principles for transmitting data

either for data or voice as data is handled by data encoder 40 and channel coder performs the

encoding as packets with a header and a delimeter for demarcating the beginning and the end of

the transmitted data embodied in a carrier wave (col. 5/lines 20-40, understood by Digital Signal

Processing technique) as well as the step of encoding a computer program of instructions for

executing computer process for converting the voice signal from the user and allowing the

Internet access on the television, see col. 3/lines 15-52 for computer application software

addressed, and col. 5/lines 9-49 for encoding processes as inputs as data or voice).

Ogasawara further discloses "routing the voice signal to a voice recognizer; recognizing/

interpreting/ analyzing the voice signal and generating command signals, the voice recognizer

being capable of recognizing/interpreting/analyzing voice signals transmitted from a plurality of

users" (Fig. 4/item 78 for a voice recognizer; col. 4/lines 29-38 for the use of voice recognition,

col. 5/line 50 to col. 6/line 4 for the step of routing the voice signal to the voice recognizer, and

col. 6/line 66 to col. 7/line 10 for more details on the voice recognizer 78); and

"accessing/browsing the requested Internet contents; and presenting accessed/browsed Internet

contents on the television via the television channel" (Figs. 5A & 5b for a browser and Internet

browsing using the browser as well as the requested transaction for downloading a particular

program or text, see col. 9/lines 14-37; and Fig. 4, col. 3/lines 53-65, and col. 4/lines 4-12 for a

TV screen for displaying the requested Internet content via the television channel using the

conventional television reception functions).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> *(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth
> in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior
> art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.*

4.   Claims 1-3, and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ogasawara (U.S. Patent No. 6,543,052 B1) in view of Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,822

B2/ or "Brown" hereinafter).

Regarding claim 1, Ogasawara discloses "a system for accessing/browsing the Internet on

a television, comprising: a phone for receiving a voice signal from a user, the voice signal

controlling a television display which is capable of displaying Internet contents via a television

channel" (Fig. 4, col. 2/lines 19-40; and col. 3/lines 44-65 and col. 4/lines 28-51 as a user uses a

remote control unit as a portable telephone for controlling a television display including Internet

accessing/browsing via a television channel, and a microphone for capturing the voice signal

from the user at the portable remote device 14). Furthermore, Ogasawara further discloses "a

voice recognizer for recognizing/ interpreting/ analyzing the voice signal and generating a

command signal, the voice recognizer being capable of recognizing/interpreting/analyzing voice

signals transmitted from a plurality of users" (Fig. 4/item 78 for a voice recognizer; col. 4/lines

29-38 for the use of voice recognition, and col. 6/line 66 to col. 7/line 10 for more details on the

voice recognizer 78); and "an Internet browser for accessing/browsing the Internet and

retrieving/organizing requested Internet contents" (Figs. 5A & 5b for a browser and Internet

browsing using the browser as well as the requested transaction for downloading a particular

program or text, see col. 9/lines 14-37).

Ogasawara does not further disclose "a stack of computers, each of the stack of

computers operable to access/browse the Internet and retrieve/organize requested Internet

contents based on the command signal and the requested Internet contents being sent from at

least one of the stack of computers to the television via the television channel"; however, Brown

teaches in a web-based platform for interactive voice response that voice signals or speech

signals from the user's telephone is received at the web-based platform (Fig. 1/item 102, and col.

2/lines 55-59), and the platform further includes a voice recognizer, or namely (other name), a

speech recognizer for recognizing, interpreting, and analyzing voice signals or speech signals

transmitted from a plurality of users (col. 3/line 53 to col. 4/line 13) to generate control signals

for accessing/browsing the Internet (col. 4/lines 47-63 & col. 5/lines 7-17); and Brown includes

an Internet browser for accessing/browsing the Internet and retrieving/organizing requested

Internet contents (Fig. 2/item 110, and col. 3/lines 23-52) as well as a stack of computers as

noted (Fig.1 and col. 3/lines 2-22) as the server 106-1 includes a group of computers as a stack of

computers for accessing/browsing the Internet and retrieving/organizing requested Internet

contents based on each user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Ogasawara's system with Brown's detailed technique in using a

web-based platform including a stack of computers as discussed in order to handle voice or

speech commands from a plurality of users, using a stack of computers, via their handset

telephones, which controls the television display and the accessing/browsing the Internet using

the web browser. The motivation for having a stack of computers as mentioned is to allow the

multiple processing of a plurality of users as the users use their telephone for requesting

simultaneous services to the system, and the system can effectively handle multiple transactions

at the same time to various types of networks as suggested by Brown.

As for claim 2, in further view of claim 1 above, Ogasawara further discloses "wherein

the television channel is a cable television channel", i.e., the user can view a normal television

channel via a cable television channel since a cable provider 20 is included for service (Fig.

1/item 20, and col. 3/lines 15-24).

As for claim 3, in further view of claim 1 above, Ogasawara further discloses "wherein

the television channel is a satellite television channel", i.e., the television channel is a satellite

television channel since a satellite system 16 is included (Fig. 1, and col. 3/lines 53-65).

As for claim 7, in further view of claim 1 above, Ogasawara and Brown disclose

"wherein the voice recognizer is operated by *a supercomputer* coupled to a phone switching

network"; as Brown suggests that the processor 130 can be any other type of digital data

processor (col. 4/lines 14-30), which also coupled to a phone switching network or a PSTN (for

Public Switching Telephone Network, see col. 4/lines 31-46). Furthermore, "a supercomputer"

simply means a high-speed computer using advanced technologies (as defined by the Newton's

Telecom dictionary); therefore, the platform IVR 102 of Brown can be inherently understood as

a supercomputer since it correlates and handles a plurality of networks, with a plurality of

computers and servers, including the Internet, an Intranet, LAN, or WAN, a cable network, a

satellite network as well as other networks such as a PSTN, a cellular or wireless and data

networks (col. 2/line 61 to col. 3/line 22), if not, it can not perform the multitasking operation (or

communication) efficiently and effectively for a plurality of users within networks. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

modify the Brown's computer system as "a supercomputer" as claimed in order to emphasize

that a super fast computer is used for handling the operation of the present system, which also

including a voice recognizer therein, for performing the communication tasks among the users

within a plurality of networks as suggested by Brown.

As for claim 8, in further view of claim 1 above, Brown further discloses "wherein the

stack of computers and the Internet browser are disposed in a cable system", i.e., Brown includes

an Internet browser for accessing/browsing the Internet and retrieving/organizing requested

Internet contents (Fig. 2/item 110, and col. 3/lines 23-52) as well as a stack of computer (Fig.1

and col. 3/lines 7-9) as the server includes a group of computers as a stack of computers for

accessing/browsing the Internet and retrieving/organizing requested Internet contents based on

each user; and these parts are parts of the network 104 or disposed in the network, while the

network 104 may represent a cable network (col. 2/line 61 to col. 3/line 22).

As for claim 9, in further view of claim 7 above, Brown further discloses "wherein the

phone switching network is coupled to a plurality of phones for routing corresponding voice

signals from the plurality of users to the voice recognizer for recognizing/interpreting/analyzing

the corresponding voice signal and generating command signals to access/browse the Internet",

i.e., network 109 represents a PSTN connected to a plurality of users at user interface device 108

for connecting to a speech recognizer 122 of the web-based IVR platform 102 for

recognizing/interpreting/analyzing the corresponding voice signal and generating command

signals to access/browse the Internet (as illustrated in Fig. 2, and see claim 1 above), and

although network 104 and 109 is illustrated separately (Fig. 1), they may be the same network or

different portions of the same network (col. 3/lines 10-22).

5.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogasawara above

in view of Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,822 B2) and Kim (US Patent no. 6,546,002 B1).

As for claim 4, in further view of claim 1 above, Ogasawara and Brown do not further

address the steps of "comprising a filter having an identification, wherein the phone has an

identification, if the identification of the phone does not match with the identification of the

filter, the filter filters out the requested Internet contents, and if the identification of the phone

matches with the identification of the filter, the filter lets the requested Internet contents pass

through such that the requested Internet contents are displayed on the television" and

"comprising filtering out the requested Internet contents by a filter if an identification of the

phone does not match with an identification of the filter, the filter letting the requested Internet

contents pass through if the identification of the phone matches with the identification of the

filter"; however, in a system for implementing an intelligent and mobile menu-interface agent

using the Internet, Kim teaches a filter within a client side (Fig. 3/item 102 for Mobile Interface

Agent MIA client, and Fig. 4 for a closer look at item 102 with a filter 210) for filtering out

necessary and unnecessary items that the system processes, for instance, recognizing the user's

ID and many other parameters for whether to forward or reject the incoming calls based on a

user profile (col. 10/lines 29-45 as the filter 210 enable and disable the user's access based on the

user profile), wherein the profile includes the user identification (Fig. 3 for profile data, and col.

8/lines 23-31), and the identification of the filter of each user is identified based on the setting up

of user ID on each MIA to create a personal ID on any machine on any platform for accessing

the MIA 102 (including a filter therein), which can be part of a set top or a phone (see col.

14/lines 18-30 & col. 16/lines 20-35 for this issue as MIA can be integrated into a set top box).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Ogasawara and Brown's system with a filter as taught by Kim in

order to filter and/or granting services from the Internet as if the filter compares the user

identification, i.e., a user ID, against the identification of filter as explained earlier, in comparing

and matching the user's identification for further processing such as allowing the Internet content

going through to the user's display on the television.

6.   Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogasawara above

in view of Kim (US Patent no. 6,546,002 B1).

As for claim 13, in further view of claim 10 above, Ogasawara does not further show the

steps of "comprising a filter having an identification, wherein the phone has an identification, if

the identification of the phone does not match with the identification of the filter, the filter filters

out the requested Internet contents, and if the identification of the phone matches with the

identification of the filter, the filter lets the requested Internet contents pass through such that the

requested Internet contents are displayed on the television" and "comprising filtering out the

requested Internet contents by a filter if an identification of the phone does not match with an

identification of the filter, the filter letting the requested Internet contents pass through if the

identification of the phone matches with the identification of the filter"; however, in a system for

implementing an intelligent and mobile menu-interface agent using the Internet, Kim teaches to

include a filter within a client side (Fig. 3/item 102 for Mobile Interface Agent MIA client, and

Fig. 4 for a closer look at item 102 with a filter 210) for filtering out necessary and unnecessary

items that the system processes, for instance, recognizing the user's ID and many other

parameters for whether to forward or reject the incoming calls based on a user profile (col.

10/lines 29-45 as the filter 210 enable and disable the user's access based on the user profile),

wherein the profile includes the user identification (Fig. 3 for profile data, and col. 8/lines 23-

31), and the identification of the filter of each user is identified based on the setting up of user ID

on each MIA to create a personal ID on any machine on any platform for accessing the MIA 102

(including a filter therein), which can be part of a set top or a phone (see col. 14/lines 18-30 &

col. 16/lines 20-35 for this issue as MIA can be integrated into a set top box). T

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Ogasawara's system with a filter as taught by Kim in order to

filter and/or granting services from the Internet as if the filter compares the user identification,

i.e., a user ID, against the identification of filter as explained earlier, in comparing and matching

the user's identification for further processing such as allowing the Internet content going

through to the user's display on the television.

7.   Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogasawara

above in view of Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,822 B2) and Lauder et al. (US Patent

6,253,238 B1).

Regarding claims 5-6, in further view of claim 1, Ogasawara and Brown do not further

disclose the system "comprising a frame grabber, the frame grabber locally refreshes the Internet

contents on the television until a subsequent user request being made" and "the frame grabber

locally refreshes the Internet contents on the television for a period of time"; however, Lauder

teaches in an interactive cable television with frame grabber that a frame grabber can be used

locally (within the user service control module) for requesting/capturing a set of video frames, or

in other words, refreshing the content locally (if captured from the Internet, we've got the

Internet content) of the receiving signals at the user's display (Fig. 14, and col. 14/lines 3-38)

based on a subsequent user's request (col. 14/lines 6-17) and the Internet contents being

refreshed are on the television for a period of time, for example, the frames can be displayed on

the television for a while as the user requests a direct access to the grabbed frame without saving

to the storage medium, a video frame is freezing for a while for the user (col. 14/lines 30-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Ogasawara and Brown's system with the teaching technique of

Lauder's frame grabber as disclosed in order to request, refresh, capture or obtain a video frame

of broadcasting contents, i.e., via the Internet network, as taught by Lauder as preferred. The

motivation for doing this is to capture a frame(s) of any interested video, either in real-time

broadcasting, and save it to a storage medium for future recall as suggested by Lauder (col.

14/lines 30-58).

8.   Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogasawara

above in view of Lauder et al. (US Patent 6,253,238 B1).

Regarding claims 14-15, in further view of claim 10 above, Ogasawara does not further

disclose the system "comprising a frame grabber, the frame grabber locally refreshes the Internet

contents on the television until a subsequent user request being made" and "the frame grabber

locally refreshes the Internet contents on the television for a period of time"; however, Lauder

teaches in an interactive cable television with frame grabber that a frame grabber can be used

locally (within the user service control module) for requesting/capturing a set of video frames, or

in other words, refreshing the content locally (if captured from the Internet, we've got the

Internet content) of the receiving signals at the user's display (Fig. 14, and col. 14/lines 3-38)

based on a subsequent user's request (col. 14/lines 6-17) and the Internet contents being

refreshed are on the television for a period of time, for example, the frames can be displayed on

the television for a while as the user requests a direct access to the grabbed frame without saving

to the storage medium, a video frame is freezing for a while for the user (col. 14/lines 30-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Ogasawara's system with the teaching technique of Lauder's

frame grabber as disclosed in order to request, refresh, capture or obtain a video frame of

broadcasting contents, i.e., via the Internet network, as taught by Lauder as preferred. The

motivation for doing this is to capture a frame(s) of any interested video, either in real-time

broadcasting, and save it to a storage medium for future recall as suggested by Lauder (col.

14/lines 30-58).

Conclusion

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Dagate et al. (US. Pat. No.6,577,605 B1) disclose a system and method for automatically

distributing multimedia calls.

Witteman (US Pat. No. 6,243,676 B1) disclose the technique of searching and retrieving

multimedia information.

Tran et al. (US Pat. No.6,157,935) disclose the remote data access and management system.

Aras et al. (US Pat. No.5,757,417) disclose a method and apparatus for screening audio-visual

materials presented to a subscriber.

10.   **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 77, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Krista Kieu-Oanh Bui whose telephone number is (703) 305-0095. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:30 PM, with alternate

Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Andrew Faile, can be reached on (703) 305-4380.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number

is (703) 306-0377.

Krista Bui
Art Unit 2611
November 18, 2003

KRISTA BUI
PATENT EXAMINER